



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,769	04/04/2001	Atsushi Itoh	205553US3	1441

22850 7590 03/17/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KRISHNAN, SUMATI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,769

Applicant(s)

ITOH, ATSUSHI

Examiner

Sumati Krishnan

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-21 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 22-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2875

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coleman (US 3702033).

Regarding claim 1, Coleman discloses a display device comprising a display portion of planar type including electronic parts for driving the display portion through external signals located inside the display portion(elements 114/116), mechanical parts for fixing the electronic parts to specified positions within the display portion comprising at least a thin metallic frame(element 14), and nuts (see element 130) mounted through the thin metallic frame). See figures 1, 8 and 9. The limitation existing in the claim that the nuts are mounted by being caulked or directly threaded is considered to be a product by process limitation and thus not given any patentable weight. Patentable weight is only given to the product claimed, not the process by which it is claimed.

Regarding claim 2, Coleman discloses the screw inserting portion of the nuts mounted through the thin metallic frame to be exposed to outer surface of the display portion of the display device, see element 130 (nut and bolt assembly) and figures 8 and 9.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Coleman's nuts (which exist both on the metallic frame as well as to support the base) are designed to mount the display device to an external device at a

Art Unit: 2875

predetermined position as well as to mount a predetermined accessory part to the display device. (See Coleman's base, element 12, which is considered to be both an external device and an accessory part.)

Claims 5, and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tajima (US 6477039). Tajima discloses a display device comprising a display portion of planar type including electronic parts for driving the display portion through external signals located inside the display portion, and mechanical parts for fixing the electronic parts to specified positions within the display portion comprising at least a thin metallic frame. In addition, Tajima discloses nuts (element 58) designed to mount a predetermined accessory part (woofer speaker, an electrical circuit part concerned in the function of the display device,) to the display device. The nuts are disclosed as being mounted on a lateral surface of the thin metallic frame of the display device, see figures 14 and 15.

Regarding claim 14, Tajima discloses the display portion including an irradiating portion with the thin metallic member supporting the irradiating portion and the planar type display portion. The limitation in the claim that the irradiating portion is disposed to irradiate light from the rear surface is considered an intended use statement and is not given any patentable weight.

Regarding claims 13 and 15-18, Tajima discloses that it is well known in the art to employ an electron-emitting device, a display device utilizing plasma discharge, a display device using liquid crystal, and a display device using a fluorescent display tube as thin planar image display devices. Applicant has not disclosed how the invention depends on utilizing specifically one of the above devices. Other alternatives include minute optical reflectors

Art Unit: 2875

known as digital micro-mirror devices. The result of each of these methods are the same, to enable an image to display on the screen. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose any one of these methods to use as the method of display.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima (US 6477039) in view of Uchiyama (US 6128183). Tajima does not disclose an end portion of the nut being reduced in size on the inner side of the display device. However, Uchiyama discloses a tapered pin which is used as a connector for a display device to enable easy engagement and a rigid attachment, to enable appropriate fitting, make more space or produce less interference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have tapered in any way, either to produce a chamfered, reduced in size, two-leveled, or a rounded end surface, because, as disclosed by the applicant, each produces the same result – oscillation resistance and impact resistance, due to the advantages listed above.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima (US 6477039) in view of Murai (US 5986726). Tajima discloses the display device of claim 1, but does not disclose a synthetic resin frame. Murai, however, discloses a display device with a synthetic resin frame supporting the electronic parts. A resin frame provides supports but provides for a much lighter thus easier to move, carry and handle. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a resin frame to support the electronic parts in order to facilitate handling.

Claims 20 and 21 and 25 are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima (US 6477039) in view of Hasegawa (US 5946062).

Art Unit: 2875

Regarding claim 20, Tajima discloses the display device of claim 1 and discloses that the display device used can be a liquid crystal display. Tajima however does not spell out the parts included in an LCD. It is well known in the art that an LCD contain a liquid crystal panel supported on optical sheets supported on a light conducting plate supported on a reflecting sheet, see for example Hasegawa. This kind of construction is extremely well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to employ this structure in the LCD of Tajima because it is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 21 and 25, Tajima's rail nut has a threaded inner surface and a smooth outer surface, and is designed to enable screwing of screws thereinto.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record neither shows nor suggests the accessory part mounted to a rear surface of the display device, nor does it show or suggest the electrical circuit part being an inverter circuit.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2875

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumati Krishnan whose telephone number is 703-305-7906. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 703-305-4939. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

SK
February 26, 2003


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800